



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,520	06/25/2003	Brian S. Christian	MS1-1511US	3658
22801	7590	01/25/2008		
LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER NGUYEN, CHAU T	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/25/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/603,520

Applicant(s)

CHRISTIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Chau Nguyen

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 10/31/2007 has been entered. Claims 1-25 are presented for examination.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

- The page and line numbers in Lines 7 and 24 should be deleted.

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyer et al. (Dyer), US Patent No. 6,839,742 and further in view of Allard et al. (Allard), US Patent No. 6,370,561.

4. As to independent claims 1 and 10, Dyer discloses a method of providing localization of a web service comprising:

receiving an HTML page request via a network from a client web browser in a requester of the web service (Figure 2B shows a user can request information via HTML page 204);

identifying a culture associated with the HTML page request by examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to identify culture identifiers (Figures 2B-2C and col. 12, lines 24-38: selecting button 205 on the HTML page 204 will take the user to HTML page 206, which includes different kinds of languages that the user can select one language that the user wants to read the web page in that selected language);

identifying a localization attribute and one or more values associated with the localization attribute in a requested page associated with the HTML page request (col. 11, lines 10-36: encoded in the URL for the web page maybe the language code, the country code (localization attribute) and other parameters (one or more values associated with the localization attribute));

determining whether one of a plurality of satellite assemblies is associated with the identified culture (col. 11, lines comparing the parameters with the information stored in the look-up tables 105 (satellite assembly));

referencing a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture to locate content in the satellite assembly associated with each of the one or more values associated with the localization attribute (col. 11, line 10 – col. 12, line 23: determining whether the parameters in the web page match information stored in the look-up tables); and

replacing the identified one or more values associated with the localization attribute with the content associated with each of the one or more value attributes or values with content associated with the identifier in the satellite assembly and transmitting the response to the client web browser in the requester of the web service (col. 11, line 10 – col. 12, line 23: and if there is a match, then the user is transferred to the localized entry page by using the path information from the look-up tables).

Dyer discloses JavaScript embedded into HTML code (col. 3, lines 12-36). However, Dyer does not explicitly disclose the satellite assembly being configured to provide the content prior to execution by a server of a script embedded in the requested page and running scripts embedded in the requested web page with the replaced identified values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page to provide a culture-dependent response.

Allard discloses a client sends a request to a server, the request includes a URL that encodes a shim script (e.g., "shim.dll"), the order object class (e.g., "book.exe"), the method to add a book to an order ("order"), and the identification of the book ("book1") is sent to the server. Allard further discloses that a server, upon receiving from the client the request that identifies the shim.dll (dynamic link library), loads and executes

the shim.dll. The shim.dll retrieves from the request an indication of an object class and a method (script) of the object class to invoke (Abstract and col. 4, lines 4-54 and col. 5, lines 15-57). Thus, this implies the claimed satellite assembly being configured to provide the content prior to execution by a server of a script embedded in the requested page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Allard with Dyer to include the satellite assembly being configured to provide the content prior to execution by a server of a script embedded in the requested page and running scripts embedded in the requested web page with the replaced identified values associated with the localization attribute in the requested page to provide a culture-dependent response. Allard suggests that the script maintain a reference to the object so that upon receiving a subsequent request from a client to invoke a function of an object, the referenced instance of the object can be used without instantiating a new object, thus it would avoid excessive overhead of instantiating objects.

5. As to dependent claims 2 and 14, Dyer discloses wherein the localize attribute further comprises the value "localize" (Dyer, col. 10, lines 30-39).

6. As to dependent claims 3 and 12, Dyer discloses wherein the identifying a culture associated with the page request further comprises identifying a culture parameter

included with a page request, the culture parameter identifying a culture (Dyer, col. 11, lines 37-52).

7. As to dependent claims 4 and 13, Dyer discloses wherein the identifying a culture associated with the page request further comprises identifying values unique to a culture in one or more headers associated with the page request (Dyer, col. 10, lines 14-29).

8. As to dependent claim 5, Dyer discloses wherein the satellite assembly further comprises a dynamically linked library (DLL) (Dyer, col. 10, line 14 – col. 11, line 36).

9. As to dependent claim 6, Dyer discloses wherein the content associated with the each of the one or more value located in the referenced satellite assembly further comprises content specific to the identified culture (Dyer, col. 10, lines 14-29).

10. As to dependent claims 7 and 15, Dyer discloses further comprising wherein determining whether one of a plurality of satellite assemblies is associated with the identified culture includes determining whether a satellite assembly associated with the identified culture is unavailable, and wherein the method further comprises referencing the satellite assembly associated with a default culture in the event that the satellite assembly associated with the identified culture is unavailable (Dyer, col. 10, lines 8-13 and col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 14).

11. As to dependent claims 8 and 15, Dyer discloses wherein the default culture further comprises a culture that is predefined to be the default culture (Dyer, col. 10, lines 8-13 and col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 14).

12. As to dependent claims 9 and 17, Dyer discloses wherein the default culture further comprises a culture that is a base culture of the identified culture, and wherein the identified culture being a culture that is derived from the base culture (Dyer, col. 10, lines 8-13 and col. 10, line 63 – col. 11, line 14).

13. As to dependent claim 11, Dyer discloses wherein the satellite assembly associated with identified culture is further configured to utilize one or more Active Server Pages guidelines to locate the localize content (Dyer, col. 6, lines 4-9).

14. As to dependent claim 16, Dyer discloses wherein the default culture is a statically defined culture (Dyer, col. 11, lines 53-62).

15. Claims 18-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frerebeau et al. (Frerebeau), US Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0135501, in view of Allard et al. (Allard), US Patent No. 6,370,561, and further in view of Dyer et al. (Dyer), US Patent No. 6,839,742.



16. As to independent claim 18, Frerebeau discloses one or more computer-readable media containing computer-executable instructions that, when executed on a computer, perform the following steps:

receiving via a network a page request from a client for web content for a preferred culture (pages 1-2, paragraphs [0017]-[0024], [0033] and page 3, paragraph [0044]: web browsers present in machines of the network 6 download the web pages and the associated files from one server to another; detecting a tag to be used in the localization of the document;);

identifying the preferred culture from the page request (pages 1-2, paragraphs [0017]-[0024] and page 3, paragraph [0044]: detecting one or more localization attributes);

determining if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available (page 3, paragraph [0044] – page 4, paragraph [0076]: retrieving the localization attributes associated with the tags and searching for the translation file corresponding to the target language or culture);

localizing the web content for the preferred culture if localized web content is available for the preferred culture (page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]: searching in a translation file for the localized value of the elements associated with localization attributes); and

localizing the web content for a default culture if localized web content is not available for the preferred culture (page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]), wherein at least one of localizing the web content for the preferred culture and

localizing the web content for a default culture includes referencing one of a plurality of satellite assemblies, selected using the identified preferred culture from the page request, to provide a localized content associated with at least one of the preferred culture and the default culture (page 2, paragraph [0019], page 4, paragraph [0055] and page 5, paragraphs [0084]-[0086]).

referencing a satellite assembly being configured to replace the localized web content with non-localized web content on the request page (Abstract and page 2, paragraphs [0017]-[0019] and [0032]-[0035]; page 3, paragraph [0044]: searching in a storage means in a translation file (a satellite assembly) corresponding to the target langue or culture for the localized value of the element associated with localization attributes); and

However, Frerebeau does not explicitly disclose referencing a satellite assembly being configured to replace the localized web content with non-localized web content on the request page prior to the computer executing a script, said script being embedded in the requested page with the provided localized web content so that when the script is executed with provided localized web content, attributes of the requested page are known before being transmitted to the client; and delivering the requested page with the executed script to the client via a network.

Allard discloses a client sends a request to a server, the request includes a URL that encodes a shim script (e.g., "shim.dll"), the order object class (e.g., "book.exe"), the method to add a book to an order ("order"), and the identification of the book ("book1") is sent to the server. Allard further discloses that a server, upon receiving from the

client the request that identifies the shim.dll (dynamic link library), loads and executes the shim.dll. The shim.dll retrieves from the request an indication of an object class and a method (script) of the object class to invoke and then the response is sent to the client (Abstract and col. 4, lines 4-54 and col. 5, lines 15-57). Thus, this implies the claimed satellite assembly being configured to provide the content prior to execution by a server of a script embedded in the requested page.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Allard with Frerebeau to include referencing a satellite assembly being configured to replace the localized web content with non-localized web content on the request page prior to the computer executing a script, said script being embedded in the requested page with the provided localized web content so that when the script is executed with provided localized web content, attributes of the requested page are known before being transmitted to the client; and delivering the requested page with the executed script to the client via a network. Allard suggests that the script maintain a reference to the object so that upon receiving a subsequent request from a client to invoke a function of an object, the referenced instance of the object can be used without instantiating a new object, thus it would avoid excessive overhead of instantiating objects.

Frerebeau and Allard, however, do not explicitly disclose identifying the preferred culture by examining content embedded in the HTTP page request.

Dyer discloses in Figures 2B-2C and col. 12, lines 24-38: selecting button 205 on the HTML page 204 will take the user to HTML page 206, which includes different kinds

of languages that the user can select one language that the user wants to read the web page in that selected language, and thus this implies different kinds of languages are embedded in the HTML page request.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dyer with Frerebeau and Allard to include identifying the preferred culture by examining content embedded in the HTTP page request for the purpose of providing information in their language if it is available and providing a convenient return mechanism for the user.

17. As to dependent claim 19, Frerebeau, Allard and Dyer (Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer) disclose determining the default culture to be a predefined default culture (Frerebeau, page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]).

18. As to dependent claim 20, Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer disclose determining the default culture to be a based culture from which the preferred culture is derived (Frerebeau, page 3, paragraph [0052] – page 4, paragraph [0073]).

19. As to dependent claim 21, Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer disclose wherein the determining if localized web content corresponding to the preferred culture is available further comprises determining if a satellite assembly associated with the preferred culture is accessible (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0034]).

20. As to dependent claim 22, Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer disclose wherein the localizing the web content further comprises: identifying a localization attribute included in the page request (Frerebeau, Abstract);

identifying key values and key attributes associated with the localization attribute (Frerebeau, Abstract); and

redirecting key values and key attributes to reference the localized web content (Frerebeau, page 1, paragraph [0017] – page 2, paragraph [0019]).

21. As to dependent claim 23, Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer disclose wherein the localization attribute further comprises the term “localize” (Frerebeau, page 4, paragraph [0075] and page 5, paragraphs [0087]-[0100]).

22. As to dependent claim 24, Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer disclose wherein the identifying a requested culture from the page request further comprises recognizing a culture parameter in the page request (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0024]).

23. As to dependent claim 25, Frerebeau-Allard-Dyer disclose wherein the identifying a requested culture from the page request further comprises recognizing one or more culture-identifying values from one or more headers associated with the page request (Frerebeau, page 2, paragraph [0024] and page 3, paragraph [0039]).

***Response to Arguments***

24. Applicant's arguments and amendments filed on 10/31/2007 have been fully considered but they are not deemed fully persuasive.

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that:

A) Frerebeau, Kerr and Berg fail to teach or fairly suggest a method that includes "receiving an HTML page request via a network from a client web browser in a requester of the web service; identifying a culture associated with the HTML page request by examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to identify culture identifiers" (see page 11, page 13 and page 15 of Remarks).

In reply to argument A, applicant's arguments with respect to newly amended features "receiving an HTML page request via a network from a client web browser in a requester of the web service; identifying a culture associated with the HTML page request by examining parameters embedded in the HTML page request to identify culture identifiers" have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection under Dyer in view of Allard. Please see the rejection above.

B) Frerebeau, Kerr and Berg fail to teach or fairly suggest a method that includes "running scripts embedded in the requested web page with the replaced identified values associated with the localization attribute in the request page to provide a culture-dependent response." (see page 11 of Remarks)

Application/Control Number:  
10/603,520  
Art Unit: 2176

Page 14

In reply to argument B, the examiner has made the rejection for this limitation by using reference Allard, not Frerebeau, Kerr or Berg as applicant argued. Please see the rejection of claim 1 above.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-4092. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from 703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2176

*/Doug Hutton/*  
Doug Hutton  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2100